

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD BUDGETS AND CONTRACTS COMMITTEE

August 14, 2007

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Introductions and Committee Leadership.....	1
Requests for Proposals (RFPs).....	1
Debrief of Public Budgets Workshops (joint discussion topic with Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC))	7
Fiscal Year 2009 (FY09) Budget Submission Update.....	9
Fiscal Year 2008 (FY08) Budget Appropriations Update	10
Committee Business.....	11
Handouts	11
Attendees.....	12

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Introductions and Committee Leadership

Gerry Pollet, Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) Chair, asked for introductions and reviewed agenda items.

No changes were made to the March meeting summary, and the committee approved the summary.

The committee conducted its leadership selection process. Nominations included Gerry Pollet for chair and Harold Heacock for vice-chair. No other nominations were made and both were selected with committee consensus. Gerry thanked the committee and expressed his appreciation of Harold's work for the committee and collaboration in leading the committee.

Requests for Proposals (RFPs)

Gerry, Harold Heacock, and Keith Smith provided issue manager presentations on their reviews of the request for proposals (RFPs) for the three Hanford Site Cleanup Contracts: Mission Support Contract, Plateau Remediation Contract, and Tank Operations Contract.

Harold discussed the scope, fee awards, and new elements of each contract. The contracts are time and materials contracts rather than "how to do it" contracts, so they do not include expected results. The contract terms and conditions are uniform between the three contracts, with variations depending on scope. The three contracts all provide a 5-10

percent award fee range and require contractors to exceed the commitments to obtain the maximum fee award. Also, more the 25 percent of cost is awarded to small businesses. Issues not addressed by the contracts include: 100 N Area; REDOX, a fuel processing facility; PUREX, a chemical processing facility; T, U, and B plants; and tank farm closure.

Harold also reviewed the content of reports on the RFPs from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and the Inspector General (IG). He noted these reports cover long-range cleanup plans, focusing primarily on addressing transuranic (TRU) waste, groundwater plan, bulk vitrification, and the Columbia River. The reports do not address changes to contracting or management methods. The reports conclude that the RFPs are well laid out, but the work scopes need to address some cleanup actions before closure.

Keith Smith reviewed the health, safety, and environmental protection aspects of the RFPs. He noted the revised RFPs demonstrate significant improvements over the draft RFPs as a result of Hanford Advisory Board (Board) advice, especially regarding health and safety issues. Keith said the RFPs need to incorporate the Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) and safety plans, which are an integral part of the overall site management plan. He said he appreciates that the contracts clearly discuss penalties for health and safety violations. Keith was concerned that most of the small contractors at Hanford are Limited Liability Corporations (LLC) for a larger entity, so penalties resulting in a maximum loss of 10 percent fee may not be large enough to impact a company's operation.

Keith noted one thing in the contracts that is unclear is how contractors have to choose or evaluate the existing ISMS plan. He is concerned a contractor could use an existing safety plan that does not appropriately address health and safety issues. He also noted the need to properly execute a safety plan to ensure its effectiveness. Keith said the RFPs address non compliance with ISMS, which is an improvement over the draft RFPs. Making ISMS part of the plan and using it to evaluate the contractor for the fee award is significant. However, Keith indicated if DOE does not do a thorough job of training their representatives then all of this work is for nothing.

Keith said the pensions and benefits sections of the RFPs have not changed. The RFPs do not clarify or indicate that new employees are under a market-based pensions and benefits plan. However, Keith acknowledged the RFPs may be written as such to allow the winning bidder to define market-based. Karen clarified that incumbent employees will be incorporated into the existing Hanford pensions and benefits plan, while new employees will be incorporated into the market-based plan.

Gerry presented how the RFPs reflect Board advice, highlighting sections of the RFPs he believes need to be revised. Gerry said the Board advised DOE that contracts should reflect Tri Party Agreement (TPA) milestones, which the RFPs do not. Gerry noted the contracts assume capping waste sites, including burial grounds, discharge sites and tank farms (leaks), which is contrary to Board values and past advice. This includes hundreds

of waste sites that have not been investigated. Gerry expressed concern that cleanup cost estimates will be underestimated if capping is assumed without including waste retrieval. He noted, for example, that if TRU needs to be retrieved the cost will be many times the cost presented in the RFPs, as the GAO recently advised (see Harold's summary above); and, that the RFPs failed to reflect the lessons from the GAO or prior Board advice in regard to the need to plan for retrieval of buried pre-70 TRU and other wastes. Failure to include this work in schedules and contract costs may be very disruptive.

Gerry said language in the Tank Operations Contract presumes the contractor will re-permit, modify and extend operations of the Demonstration Bulk Vitrification System (DBVS). The current permit and basis for approval are limited to a year of operation. This presumption in the contract is not consistent with the Board's advice that the contract should not presume or authorize work that has not been evaluated under NEPA and may not reflect TPA or regulatory approval. In this case the DBVS is subject to evaluation and decisions on supplemental treatment following the Tank Waste Closure and Waste Management EIS.

Likewise, although NEPA review with an EIS and additional environmental permitting is still required before a supplemental treatment decision can be made, the contract authorizes the TWOC to construct two four-line bulk vitrification plants (200E and 200W) and a pretreatment facility. This represents a significant conflict of interest by having the contractor responsible for evaluating DBVS to have the contract for design and construction of multi-billion dollar facilities using bulk vitrification, without competition. The lack of competition, Gerry noted, is not consistent with GAO and Army Corps' recommendations and concerns in regard to the current Vitrification Plant construction and its delays and cost overruns.

Contract language addressing tank waste appears based on reclassifying tank waste as TRU waste. This, Gerry noted, is likely inconsistent with recent court decisions and erroneously presumes that New Mexico would permit renamed High-Level Nuclear Waste from tanks to be disposed as TRU in WIPP. The Tank Operations Contract specifies retrieving 90% of the tank waste, which Gerry does not believe is an acceptable standard for reducing tank leaks. The TOC specified that the impacts to groundwater from tank leaks be reduced by 90%, which appears to be an entirely arbitrary standard unrelated to the legal requirements for cleanup, which the contract should specify meeting.

Capping – rather than retrieving waste and remediating - thousands of burial grounds, ditches, and pipe lines is specified as the selected remediation method in the workscope for the PRC, despite the facts that: no characterization has occurred; cleanup laws establish a strong priority for retrieving and utilizing “permanent remedies” (not caps); and, no regulatory approved cleanup decisions have been made for these sites.

Gerry said the cost and fee description has been changed in the RFPs to offer contractors between 5-10% fee award. 10% fee awards are excessive given the lack of capital risk for the contractor in cost plus award fee contracts. Gerry noted that his organization had

objected to the specification of 10% of the entire cost of each year's contract available as fee award. The RFPs reflect a major change calling for offerors to propose fee between 5 and 10%, appearing to recognize that 10% would be excessive across the board. On the other hand, Gerry urged the committee to recommend to the Board advice stating that specific investments in technologies, approval of waste disposal at other locations reducing the total burden at Hanford, or tackling of difficult problems with risk to the contractor, should be rewarded with higher (than 5%) fee.

Gerry expressed concern there is a risk that if TOC and PRC fee awards are 10% DOE could end up spending a lot of money in contractor awards (profit), which should have been spent on cleanup. The 8% fee award for the Mission Support Contract seems high given the lack of risk. In addition, Gerry said there is no reduction in fee schedule for cost and schedule overruns; the contractor is guaranteed 25% of the fee.

Proposed advice principles:

1. The contracts must not set different expectations, or pre-empt the TPA and regulatory processes.
2. The Scope of work for both TOC and CPC should include retrieval of contaminants and wastes in the soil to the extent practicable, with submission of costs and plans to reflect this expectation and consistent with state and federal laws.
3. The RFPs should be amended to reflect award fees scaled to contractor financial risk and innovation. Available award fees should be below 10% (CPC, TOC) and 8% (MSC) of all costs, with fees approaching such levels only for specified work if the contractor: succeeds in using their own funds to develop technology or processes; offers safe, regulated alternatives to disposal at Hanford (thus, reducing the cumulative soil and groundwater impacts); or, otherwise bears a risk that is unusual for a cost plus fee contract.
4. At \$2 billion per year appropriated for Hanford Clean-Up, a five percent difference in overhead costs means that \$100 million worth of more real work can be done. The RFPs should be amended to reflect Hanford Advisory Board Advice 112 (advising: "Overall cost efficiency and overhead reduction.") and prior advice on reducing overhead costs, including the mandated use of a uniform system of functional accounts for each contractor with reporting and disclosure.
5. The RFPs should be amended to have clear expectations of loss of fee for violations of worker health, safety (including retaliation) and environmental protection rules.
6. Tank Operations Contract work scope should be amended to accommodate support of design and eventual waste transfer to facilities using whichever technologies are chosen for supplementing Integrated Low Activity Waste (ILAW) vitrification, which may be additional ILAW capacity, following full NEPA and regulatory processes.

Karen Lutz, Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), said Leif Erickson, DOE-RL, was unavailable to attend the meeting to provide an update on the RFPs. DOE-RL is developing a summary of DOE actions on the RFPs as a result of Board advice. Karen encouraged the committee to submit specific questions regarding the RFPs to DOE, which would be posted along with answers on the Central Plateau acquisitions Web site (<http://www.hanford.gov/cpc/>).

Regulator Perspectives

Melinda Brown, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said Ecology is not part of the RFP development and contractor selection process. Melinda said she would like more specific information on how the scopes of work for the contracts reflect the outcomes of the TPA negotiations. Ecology believes the contracts need to incorporate results of the TPA negotiations. Ecology does not expect DOE to direct or incentivize contractors to ignore the TPA, but understands DOE might provide incentives to contractors that figure out how to more effectively comply with TPA milestones.

Melinda said capping decisions have not been made for waste sites and it is probably optimistic to think capping is an acceptable end state in all cases. She said the same is true regarding supplemental treatment. The Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TCWM EIS) should evaluate a number of alternatives and identify one with the least environmental impact. Also, Melinda said Ecology has withheld their approval of reclassifying TRU waste as low-level waste because they have concerns about creating a waste form New Mexico will not accept.

Melinda said Ecology is interested to see how the contracts are executed. She noted DOE took extensive comments on these RFPs, and said she expects DOE to consider comments and discussions in budget and cleanup decisions. She noted that DOE provided significant clarification and made changes to the RFPs.

Committee Discussion

- Gerry said it is difficult to locate the RFPs and supporting documents on the procurement Web site (www.doe.pr.gov). The Central Plateau Web site (<http://www.hanford.gov/cpc/>) is much easier to navigate and access the RFP information. Karen noted there is a link to the Central Plateau Web site from the Hanford Web site (www.hanford.gov). Gerry suggested DOE develop a short description to include on the Web page for each of the twelve attachments to make it easier to identify and locate documents.
- *How can DOE include a cleanup method in a contract scope when TPA negotiations are ongoing?* Gerry said the proposed RFP advice encourages DOE to include language in the RFPs to inform contractors that work scope will be determined by upcoming NEPA, regulatory and TPA decisions, outlining potential work for the bidders to submit proposals in regard to how they would perform and at what cost. This would also ensure that contractors would not claim they cannot perform proposed work because it is outside the scope. Dirk Dunning said the key is how the

process is structured. If regulations are followed, contractors could spend a lot of time up front with the investigation and not get much cleanup done. ???

- *Is there a widespread assumption that Hanford pensions are too lucrative?* Keith said there is not an assumption that Hanford pensions are too lucrative, but when he worked at Hanford the rumor was that Hanford pensions were higher than pensions at other sites. The Hanford pension was truncated in 1965 and Keith said he saw people retire in 1980 with a \$96 per month pension. In 1986 they negotiated better pensions and consolidated all existing pensions.
- *Is there a requirement in the RFPs for contractors to use the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response (HAMMER) training center?* Keith said the contracts do not indicate how HAMMER can improve safety. Keith said the Health, Safety and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP) will work on providing a letter to DOE on this topic.
- *Does the Tank Operation Contract include retrieving all of the tank waste?* Based on his review of the RFPs' scopes of work, Harold said the Tank Operations Contract RFP indicates tanks need to be cleaned up but does not specify how clean they need to be. Tank closures are mentioned but not details about how to achieve closure. Gerry added that the RFP does specify mitigating the groundwater impact of leaks to 90% and adding grout to the bottom of tanks, but does not stipulate the need to meet TPA retrieval schedule for 2018, nor specify that leaks must be remediated and residues removed to the extent practicable.
- *What kind of a contract is DOE getting if there is no schedule and agreement to meet TPA milestones?* Ken felt it does not sound like the contract would move towards closure/completion. Harold noted that a fixed contract requires promises on both sides. Based on how the contracts are written, contractors have to have the ability to do the work, but DOE is not sure what they will have them do.
- *Should the contract reflect DOE is providing funding to meet the single-shell tank retrieval date?* Ken said DOE should indicate in the contract that they are renegotiating TPA milestones. Harold said advice should emphasize that the contract be consistent with TPA milestones provided there is money available. Gerry said Ecology has an expectation that DOE will request funding to meet TPA milestones. He expressed concern that if the work scope does not require meeting TPA milestones then it will be presumed DOE is not requesting funding for this work.
- Ken said contract language does not address the level of effort the contractor needs to provide on tank cleanup. Gerry suggested the RFP should indicate work will be done following the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) treatment decision determined by the TCWM EIS.
- Ken believes the committee should support basing the higher contractor award fee structure on the element of risk and innovation. From a corporate perspective, with opportunity to go after many jobs, Harold said it is reasonable for contractors to want a return on the investment. Ken believes the revised RFP language reflects an awareness of the concern that an 8% fee is not acceptable. The committee generally agreed to indicate to DOE that the committee is pleased the new RFPs reflect their

concerns and suggest providing incentives for innovative technologies and assuming risk.

- Harold said he supports emphasizing health and safety but also imposing a loss of fee for violations. Keith suggested the potential loss of fee should be greater for higher risk work. The committee generally supported the addition of the loss of fee for health and safety violations in the RFPs.
- *Are there Beryllium (Be) policies in the RFPs?* Ken said he believes Be policies should be included in the RFPs, but wondered if there were other health policies that should also be included. Gerry said Be policy is the only one he is aware of.
- The committee generally supported the recommendation to advise DOE that the contracts should make provisions for supplemental contract facilities after TPA milestone negotiations are complete and NEPA cleanup decisions are made.
- The committee discussed contract language advising early design and construction of a facility to ship waste to Yucca Mountain in Nevada. Dirk said originally the draft RFPs included this to prepare for shipping waste out of Hanford, but the whole contract would have expired before they got to that point. Gerry clarified that the contract outlines building a rail car facility for shipping waste; this scope of work includes designing and constructing the shipping facility. The committee generally agreed building a shipping facility is premature given the status of the schedule to identify a repository location.
- Karen said she talked with Rick Jansons, Board Vice Chair, to plan an agency update on the status of TPA negotiations at the September Board meeting.

Debrief of Public Budgets Workshops (joint discussion topic with Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC))

The committee discussed the results of the public budgets workshops. Karen indicated that the results and comments are available on the Hanford Web site (www.hanford.gov). The information includes a summary of DOE outreach efforts to develop a process for discussing the 2009 budget submittal with Department of Energy – Headquarters (DOE-HQ) and to identify public values on Hanford cleanup. Karen said DOE developed some new outreach tools and improved the Web site to enable the public to submit online comments. DOE held a meeting with the regulators and the Board to discuss their approach. Five public meetings were held around the region. DOE used a tool that displayed DOE's cleanup priorities and asked the public to identify the topics they felt should be priorities. Karen said the exercise provided DOE with something that created a dialogue with the public. DOE received a lot of positive feedback on the meetings and their approach.

Based on public comments and discussion, DOE noted the public considers the following topics to be of highest priority: continued groundwater cleanup, tank farms, soils, and the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP). DOE produced pie charts to compare DOE priorities and public priorities. DOE also developed a matrix to document how many people

participated in the meetings and their priorities choices. Karen noted that fewer people participated in the exercise at the Hood River meeting than at other meetings; however, DOE captured public comments in other ways (e.g., writing, Web site, and individual conversations). All this information was submitted to DOE-HQ and is available on the Hanford Web site (www.hanford.gov). Additional comments are sent to DOE-HQ and posted to the Web site as they are received.

Jeff Frey, DOE-RL, said workshop participants included a wide variety of people who demonstrated an understanding of cleanup issues. Steve Wiegman, Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), said he learned a lot from public comments through the sequence of meetings. He supports continuing to hold these meetings and document public comment and discussions. Steve thought it was well worth the effort and the participation from folks with broader views and including multiple ways for participation was helpful to the whole process. One of the things he observed during the meetings was that each group at each location identified what cleanup components are important to them. This helps DOE understand how to focus the discussion on topics that are meaningful to a particular group or location.

Regulator Perspectives

- Sharon Braswell, Ecology, said there was a very strong message from the public that cleanup funding needs to increase to address cleanup needs. Sharon said the meeting format and room arrangement facilitated comments and dialogue. Ecology appreciated the public comments and dialogue, which help Ecology ensure their priorities match the publics. Sharon emphasized the meetings were a team effort between DOE and Ecology.

Committee Discussion

- Gerry acknowledged there was resistance to participating in the exercise at the meeting in Hood River. DOE only received two comment charts from this meeting but there were 10 to 12 people at the meeting. The people at the meeting were well informed on Hanford cleanup issues, so the lack of participation was not for a lack of knowledge.
- Norma Jean Germond expressed frustration with the focus on shipping plutonium off-site at the meeting in Portland. Gerry indicated the focus on plutonium may have been due to the attendance of well-informed people who oppose nuclear fuel.
- *Was feedback from the meetings used by DOE managers to affect the Fiscal Year 2009 (FY09) submission?* Karen said DOE managers reviewed public comments and results gathered from the meetings to identify public values and priorities for the FY09 budget submission. Public comments and the results of the meetings were sent to DOE-HQ with the FY09 budget submission.
- *How many people at the Richland meeting were participating as a member of the public versus as a worker?* Karen said she thought you could have made that distinction at any of the meetings, since there are different constituent groups in different locales. Gerry added that twelve of nineteen people at the Richland meeting

were HAB members and the others were contractors that could have been voting for the project on which they are bidding. Barb Wise noted that few participants supported just one priority during the exercise. Ken said the most outspoken individual at the Richland meeting was a non-affiliated member of the public.

- Helen Wheatley commented that a goal of the meeting planning process was to utilize an approach that would provide the public with a means to engage in Hanford cleanup issues instead of just registering comments.
- Al suggested DOE try to notify the media in advance of this event and provide information about the new funding priorities so the public feels like they were heard. Karen said they just completed getting the meeting results posted on the Web and plan to make an announcement to DOE employees because they do not always get to hear about these efforts. DOE is also sending a postcard to all participants to tell them the results are posted on the Web and to follow-up with each participant. Ken suggested getting the meeting results covered in the local paper. Al suggested DOE try to get on television before the event and provide a sound bite from the last meeting, which could generate more interest.

Fiscal Year 2009 (FY09) Budget Submission Update

Jeff Frey, DOE-RL, distributed a memo sent to James Rispoli, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, outlining DOE-RL's funding priorities for FY09. Jeff also summarized the FY09 budget submission and FY08 budget allocation. Jeff discussed requested and allocated funding levels for each project baseline (PBS).

Jeff said he was unable to discuss any funding changes in the budget at this time. Pam Zimmerman, DOE-RL, added that DOE is still working through these budget requests.

Steve Wiegman, DOE-ORP, provided some general comments on the FY09 budget submission. He noted that the \$690 million for the WTP is the minimum funding amount for that project. Funding for the tank farms is challenging because it mainly supports minimum operations and one retrieval per year, which Steve acknowledged is not consistent with stakeholder values or regulatory milestones. However, he noted tank retrieval is a priority and he believes the funding request for this work will receive serious consideration. DOE-ORP is almost finished with testing bulk vitrification and will be able to make a decision whether to move forward with it as the supplemental treatment method of choice. Decisions regarding tank waste retrieval and bulk vitrification will be the most significant ongoing funding topics.

Committee Discussion

- *Did anything moved from under-target to over-target?* Jeff said the groundwater program (PBS-RL30) moved from under to over target. He said DOE-RL moved all of the River Corridor activities up and moved the Central Plateau issues down.

- *Has any funding changed regarding tank farm operations?* Steve said the submission for tank farm operations is the same, but the FY09 submittal includes differences in how DOE plans to apply tank operations.

Fiscal Year 2008 (FY08) Budget Appropriations Update

Jeff Frey, DOE-RL, reviewed the budget summary chart and compared the FY08 request with the House Appropriations markup for each program. He noted additional funding on retrieval of TRU waste that will help DOE meet TPA milestones. There is also an increase in Central Plateau decontamination and decommissioning (D&D). The increase in River Corridor funding brings it up to 95% of the contract. Jeff said there has been no change since they previously reviewed the budget for HAMMER.

Steve reviewed funding for the DOE-ORP programs. He said the House of Representatives cut \$100 million from the President's budget request. Steve said any funding above DOE's minimum operations on tank farms is good and they will have to figure out where to focus that funding if it is allocated. The TPA negotiations will drive that decision process. Steve said he thinks they are very close to getting an agreement to begin construction for pretreatment. Steve said it depends on the budget; if DOE does not get that money back now they will have to make it up later.

Regulator Perspectives

- Melinda said Ecology sent a letter to DOE on July 11, 2007 regarding the FY09 budget submission, focusing on the WTP delay, Ecology's response on slowing down tank retrieval, and low level waste and TRU waste retrieval milestones. Melinda said Ecology is concerned about the waste along the Columbia River. They also have concerns about groundwater and soil as well as small waste sites on the Central Plateau. She said DOE could do some removal which would allow them access to some of the more difficult sites. Ecology would like to see DOE move forward on pump and treat and some characterizing of waste sites, but current funding does not support those activities. Melinda said Ecology's main cleanup priorities are retrieving tank waste and protecting groundwater.

Committee Discussion

- Gerry said in years past the Board was given a dollar amount for each PBS and he is disappointed DOE did not provide that information this year. Although DOE says nothing has changed with the list of work since April from under-target to over-target. Gerry said the committee is not being informed of any dollar amounts being changed within. Al commented that it is important for DOE to demonstrate its cleanup commitments by requesting funding to meet TPA milestones. Dirk said the Congressional budget request is less than $\frac{3}{4}$ of what is needed to address priority cleanup work at Hanford.

- *If there was more funding for tank farm operations, does Ecology have a plan for where that money would go?* Melinda said retrieving more tanks and tank waste is one of Ecology's priorities. Steve said he thinks DOE-ORP would put funding for tank farm operations towards bulk vitrification, but that would be determined by what the results of the TPA negotiations. Gerry said he believes public input suggests putting it into waste retrieval not supplemental treatment.
- *What cleanup work is impacted if the 2008 budget negotiations continue?* Melinda said Congress frames the continuing resolutions, which can be based on many things but the level that can be used as a baseline will be very prescriptive. Until DOE knows what that framework is for the continuing resolution, they can run many scenarios but will not know how to spend the money until the resolution is signed. Melinda said if a budget decision is not made by October 1 then they will move into the continuing resolution process.
- Gerry suggested the committee should discuss how the FY08 budget allocation will be discussed with the Board.

Committee Business

- Gerry will draft advice on the RFPs, followed by a committee phone call at the end of next week.
- Reserve a half day meeting placeholder in September and the committee will wait to see what comes from Congress about the budget before deciding whether or not to meet.
- October response to the RFP advice.
- Committee members should send Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz specific questions on the RFPs so he can get them to Karen to be answered and posted on the Central Plateau procurement Web site.

Handouts

NOTE: Copies of meeting handouts can be obtained through the Hanford Advisory Board Administrator at (509) 942-1906, or tholm@enviroissues.com

- RFP Comments, Keith Smith, August 2007.
- FY 2008 and 2009 Budget Summary, DOE, August 2007.
- Formulating the FY 2009 Budget and Cleanup Priorities, DOE-RL, August 2007.
- Memorandum: Fiscal Year 2009 Environmental Management Budget Submittal for the US Department of Energy (DOE), Office of River Protection (ORP), DOE-ORP, July 30, 2007.
- US DOE-RL and ORP FY2009 Cleanup Budget/Priorities Outreach (includes sample materials from budget meetings and a summary of priority findings), DOE, July 2007.
- Tank Farms, Central Plateau, Mission Support Contracts Requests For Proposals (RFPs) Review for Budget and Contracts Committee, Gerry Pollet, August 14, 2007.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Al Boldt	Gary Peterson	
Dirk Dunning	Gerry Pollet	
Ken Gasper	Keith Smith (phone)	
Norma Jean Germond	Bob Suyama	
Harold Heacock	Gene Van Liew	
Laura Mueller	Helen Wheatley (phone)	

Others

Jeff Frey, DOE-RL	Sharon Braswell, Ecology	Emily Neff, EnviroIssues
Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, EnviroIssues
Carrie Meyer, DOE-RL	Ben Hampton, Ecology	Barb Wise, FH
Pam Zimmerman, DOE-RL		
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP		
Cynthia Kious, DOE-ORP		
Ken Till, DOE-ORP		
Steve Wiegman, DOE-ORP		